APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,724	11/29/2001	Hirokazu Kawamoto	862.C2450	1850

5514	7590	05/20/2004		

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
WOO, ISAAC M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	6

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/995,724		KAWAMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner		**Art Unit**
	Isaac M Woo		2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) *25-48* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant elected Group I, claims 1-24 with traverse in the paper No. 5, filed on April 26, 2004. However, the restriction was proper. Because the inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The applicant's the ground(s) of the traversal, is not found persuasive. Because one application should have one invention and examining different invention on one application is burden.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I, II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instance case, invention I can be used for storing conflict process rules and generating complementary rules and updating data in accordance with the conflict process rules and the complementary rules. Invention II can be used for matching set up conditions with each other, and controlling matching set up conditions and determining control parameters based on conditions. Invention III can be used for detecting setup information for predetermined object to be changed by applying the conflict rules and set up information changing via user interface. See MPEP 806.05(d). Therefore, the restriction was proper.

2.   Claims 1-24 are presented for examination and claims 25-48 are withdrawn from

consideration as being drawn on the non-elected inventions.

3.   The pending claims are 1-48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Monahan et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,159,597, hereinafter, "Monahan").

With respect to claims 1, 10, 17 and 24, Monahan discloses, storage means

(storage, col. 4, lines 4-24) for storing conflict process rules that indicate conflict

avoidance descriptions, see (abstract, col. 1, lines 5-67 to col. 2, lines 1-67 to col. 3,

lines 1-25, error recovery processing system of Monahan discovers errors (conflict

process), and corrects them, which avoids the system conflicts, col. 8, lines 31-65);

complementary rule (series of actions, col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3,

lines 1-25) generation means for generating complementary rules that indicate

complementary conflict avoidance descriptions on the basis of the conflict process rules

stored in the storage means, see (col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3, lines 1-

25, when error is discovered, series of actions are generated base on error discovered

actions); and update means for updating the input setup data in accordance with the

conflict process rules and the complementary rules, see (col. 1, lines 47-67, col. 2, lines

54-67). Monahan discloses updating data (col. 1, lines 47-67, col. 2, lines 54-67).

Monahan does not explicitly disclose, updating input setup data. However, Monahan

discloses changing in the configuration of a data. The configuration data is setup data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to include updating input setup data in the system of the

Monahan. Because the configuration data (setup data) provides the system's basic

processing rules, thus it can be changed by processing rules.

With respect to claims 2, 11 and 18, Monahan discloses, storage means stores a

plurality of conflict process rules for one state of one function of the object to be

controlled having two states, and does not store any conflict process rule for the other

state, the complementary rule generation means generates inverse logic of the conflict

process rules for the one state as complementary rules to conflict process rules for the

other state, see (col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 3, Monahan discloses, storage means stores the conflict process rules as a conflict process rule description file, see (col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3, lines 1-25).

With respect to claims 4, 12 and 19, Monahan discloses, conflict process rule description file is described in accordance with a predetermined markup language, see (col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3, lines 1-25).

With respect to claims 5, 13 and 20, Monahan discloses, conflict process rule description file describes local rules which can be applied to only a specific object to be controlled, and a universal rule description file that describes universal rules which can be commonly applied to a plurality of objects to be controlled is externally referred to, see (col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3, lines 1-25, col. 8, lines 31-65).

With respect to claims 6, 14 and 21, Monahan discloses, conflict process rule description file contains a description of an update command of the user interface, see (col. 4, lines 4-59).

With respect to claim 7, 15 and 22, Monahan discloses, complementary rule generation means for additionally writing the generated complementary rules in the conflict process rule description file, see (col. 1, lines 13-67, col. 2, lines 54-67 to col. 3, lines 1-25).

With respect to claims 8, 16 and 23, Monahan discloses, setup data have been updated upon applying the conflict process rules or the complementary rules by the update means, see (col. 1, lines 47-67, col. 2, lines 54-67).

With respect to claim 9, Monahan discloses, object to be controlled is an image forming apparatus, see (col. 1, lines 47-67, col. 2, lines 54-67).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Felouzis et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,673) discloses the system for life safety network in which a remote computer system downloads one or more module databases to a panel subsystem connected to various input and output devices. The panel subsystem includes interconnected target modules having a processor and a memory portion. The memory portion of each target module stores an executable code and a particular module database. For each target module, the computer system generates a source code of descriptive labels and rules, converts the source code to the module database, and downloads the module database to the target module. The module database provides the executable code with module-specific information for controlling the input devices and said plurality of output devices. In addition, the computer system

may generate primary module code and secondary module code so that, when

downloading both codes to a particular target module, the particular target module may

retain the primary module code and forwards the secondary module code to a

secondary module.

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Isaac M Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0081. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IMW
May 11, 2004

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER